UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Where Are These Fifth Columns? - - - - - - - - *E. Dixwell Chase*

Prelude to Tyranny - - *O. A. Hammand*

Why Democracy Often Fails - - - - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

War, Women, and Poets - *May Stranathan*

Humanism and the Present Religious Horizon — Part II - - *A. Stiernotte*

THE STUDY TABLE

VOLUME CXXV NUMBER 12

Chicago, August 19, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 179

ARTICLES—
Where Are These Fifth Columns?—E. DIXWELL CHASE 181
Prelude to Tyranny—O. A. HAMMAND 183
Why Democracy Often Fails—VICTOR S. YARROS 184
War, Women, and Poets—MAY STRANATHAN 185
Humanism and the Present Religious Horizon—Part II—A. STIERNOTTE 186
On the Pacifist Front—XX 189

POETRY—
Shot by Both Sides—RALPH CHEYNEY 183

THE STUDY TABLE—
"Good It Is"—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 190
The Question of Intolerance—JAMES M. YARD 191
Missions and the American Frontier—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 191

CORRESPONDENCE—
Washington and Lincoln—HENRY W. PINKHAM 192
A UNITY Subscriber in Sweden—RUTH RANDALL EDSTROM 192

THE FIELD—
Employment Bars—*A. C. L. U. Bulletin* 178

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Employment Bars

Maintaining that national defense is not promoted by wholesale denial of employment and public relief to aliens and members of unpopular movements, the American Civil Liberties Union has come out in vigorous opposition to action to bar completely from the public service or private employment Communists and members of the German-American Bund.

Considered by the Union as "deprivation of civil rights wholly without justification" are congressional action to remove Communists and Bundists from W.P.A. and to prohibit private employers engaged in interstate commerce from hiring them, and the recent order by the U. S. Civil Service Commission refusing to certify any member of the Communist Party or Bund.

In a statement on these measures, the Union's Board of Directors held that "the reasonable argument that aliens may not be suitable for certain jobs does not justify any blanket rule of exclusion." All employers, public and private, have adequate discretion to select persons suitable for jobs, according to the A. C. L. U. The line should be carefully drawn "between restraints imposed by sound public policy and prohibitions dictated by prejudice."

"It may fairly be argued that some citizens, because of their proved attitude to the government of the United States or the principles of democracy, are not qualified for certain public services. But it cannot be fairly argued that the government may by law bar from private employment persons because of political beliefs.

Wholesale exclusion of Communists and Bundsmen from public service is indefensible so long as they belong to legal organizations functioning openly, the A. C. L. U. declared. If they are disqualified because of sympathy with a foreign government opposed to democracy, the Union points out that if such a disqualification is laid down "in a time of hysteria and hostility to those governments," it can readily be applied as well to Italian-American supporters of Fascist Italy and others.

"Precedents established now in a time of hysteria will compromise our democracy for years to come. It is time enough for the government to act against Communist or Nazi movements when they contravene our laws by activities hostile to our form of government. The individual cases of law violation by members of these organizations already tried, constitute no basis for such sweeping measures as these."

The Union announced it would offer its services to test in the courts any or all of the proposals barring Communists and Bundists from employment.

A. C. L. U. Bulletin

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXV MONDAY, AUGUST 19, 1940 No. 12

WAR!

"I don't believe in war. I am ashamed of war, and I say so. I not only don't believe in this war; I don't believe in any war. . . .

"In Europe these days I'm looking for popular as distinguished from geographical or dynastic results. I care nothing for great empires. I care only for the crowd out of which great empires have been welded. The grandiose empires may dissolve today, and I'd not shed a tear over their remains. . . .

"I don't care how soon kings are gone; how soon all armies and navies are abolished. I want everything that comes between people got out of the way. I want to get the earth together."

Horace Traubel (1915).

CAN ANYTHING BE WORSE THAN WAR?

Dr. Earnest A. Hooton, of Harvard, world-famous anthropologist, said some things at the recent session of the Harvard Summer School which are worth pondering. Referring to the present plight of Europe, he declared that it was traceable to the World War of 1914-18, since that war was "largely responsible for the decline in human physique, intelligence and morality which has led in Europe to the abandonment of individual liberty and free institutions." Continuing, he said:

> War kills and cripples the best and most vigorous of the breeding stock and wreaks havoc upon the nervous and endocrine organization of potential mothers, thereby lowering the quality of the offspring which they produce. It depresses nutritional and general environmental conditions, so that a post-war generation is conceived in pathology and born in despair.

This, of course, is nothing new. It was the preachment for years of Dr. David Starr Jordan, who argued as an eminent biologist that war sapped the race of those very qualities of blood and breed, of body, mind and spirit, which could alone maintain the civilization for which war was being fought. War, in other words, strikes at the very root of those very things which are presented by non-pacifists as the justification of war. Which immediately raises the question—can anything be worse than war? Yes, we are told—the loss of liberty is worse than war. But war itself loses this very liberty for which you choose to fight, as witness Professor Hooton's statement that the last war led straight to that "abandonment of individual liberty and free institutions" which has annihilated European civilization. Yes—the loss of national entity, we are told, is worse than war. But how many European nations have now lost their national existence just because of that "decline in human physique, intelligence, and morality" which was the result of the last war? "It is better to die fighting on our feet," we are told flamboyantly these days, "than to live bowing on our knees." But what if the fighting on our feet forces us feebly to our knees, where we perish of weakness and despair? War is itself the complete destroyer. Only by abandoning war can we hope to save anything. The last war brought us starvation, misery, chaos, Naziism, Hitler, the present horror. Yet there are those who would go to war again—to save mankind!!

THE THIRD TERM TRADITION

This tradition is now squarely before the American people for settlement. We shall know in November whether a man may hold the presidential office for two terms *and no more,* or whether he may stay in the White House term after term, i.e., as long as he can persuade the electorate to keep him there. Personally, we have always felt the tradition was wise and wholesome. As we look into our mind, we discover that our reaction toward the attempt to break the outrageous tradition is very much the same as was our reaction toward the attempt to pack the Supreme Court. Yet, as we ponder the problem, we cannot seem to persuade ourself that there is anything necessarily sacrosanct in a democracy about the two term limitation. We do not apply it to mayors—as witness the fact that we are all for a third term for Mayor La Guardia, of New York City. We do not impose the rule on governors—as witness Governor Lehman, of New York, who, if we recollect correctly, is now serving his fourth term. The president of Switzerland, we understand, may serve an indefinite number of terms, though there can be no direct succession; intervals must intervene between terms. The prime minister of Britain may head the government as often as the voters return his party to office; several prime ministers have served three terms. Gladstone served four, but, with the exception of Walpole in the eighteenth century, the opposition had a chance between one term and another. No, there is nothing sacrosanct about the "no third term" idea. It is only a tradition established by Washington, commended and sustained by Jefferson, Jackson, and Wilson, which

may be broken if the progress of time, or sudden exigencies of circumstance, seem to make this either desirable or advisable. For traditions, like certain customs referred to on an occasion by Hamlet, are sometimes "more honored in the breech than in the observance." This, it seems to us, is the issue presented to the American people by the determination of President Roosevelt to run for a third term. Is there any emergency, any crisis, which makes it important in terms of national safety, that the present administration be continued for another four years? If so, the people in a democracy should be free to hold to their leader. If not, then it would be wise to hold to established tradition.

THE INDISPENSABLE MAN!

But there is another side to this question—at least as presented in the case of Mr. Roosevelt! We refer to the idea, imposed upon the third term issue by the way in which the President accepted the nomination tendered him at Chicago, that the man in office—namely, himself—is "indispensable" to the republic in the present dilemma of the world. Mr. Roosevelt stated clearly that he had no desire nor purpose to continue as President. He declared that he had made plans for his return to private life which were close to his heart. But every inclination he had reluctantly put aside in view of the crisis of the hour which made his services as President for another four years not only desirable but necessary for the nation's welfare. The same reasoning will apply, of course, four years hence when, in all probability, the world crisis and America's relation thereto will be even more terrible than it is today! Now is this reasoning sound? Applying the argument to second terms and fourth terms as well as third terms, are we to accept the contention that any man is indispensable to a nation? We do not think so! On the contrary, we count it the very essence of the democratic principle that there is no one man ever indispensable to mankind, but that always the rich soil of humanity can grow and produce the leader needed to meet the times. The indispensability idea belongs to monarchy, not to democracy. It is the bedrock of totalitarian dictatorship—that there is one man, and no other, to lead the people! In saying this we are most certainly not accusing Mr. Roosevelt of being, or desiring to be, an American dictator. We are simply pointing to the principle—that in a democracy it is men and not any one man who may be called indispensable. History has proved this again and again. Thus, Pitt the Younger might well have been deemed indispensable to England in the awful crisis following Austerlitz, but he died, and others continued the war against Napoleon to the triumph at Waterloo. Lincoln certainly seemed indispensable in 1865—had he finished out his second term, it would surely have been better for the nation. But he was killed—and America carried on. No, this indispensability idea is pure fantasy. Worse, it is a betrayal of the democratic faith. Let it not bewitch us this fall!

HOW HITLER IS CONQUERING AMERICA

Yes, the conquest has already begun! The troops have not arrived, but the policies have. Bombs have not been dropped upon us, but ideas are everywhere exploding and blowing our democracy to bits. Thus, the FUEHRER has already laid his war-indemnity upon us. Of course, we call it taxes for defense. But one name is no better than another, as money is taken from our pockets at the order of Hitler and spent for purposes dictated by his will. Then, labor camps are being organized for boys and girls—1,500,000 of our best youth, we are told, are to be seized by the government and interned for a year, or eighteen months, for training in hard work. Even Mrs. Roosevelt has come out in support of this policy, which is copied direct from the Nazi youth program in Germany. If Hitler were here, as he is in France, and were laying down his law upon us, he could not do anything worse to our young men and women than we now are planning to do ourselves. Worst of all is the proposal for universal military training. In a bill introduced into the Senate by Senator Burke, it is provided that some 40,000,000 men shall be conscripted for training in one form or another of military defense work. What on earth the government will do with 40,000,000 men nobody seems exactly to know. Crazy legislation of this type will not be passed even in these crazy times! But conscription is a very present danger—and, of course, in essence nothing in the world but the adoption right out of hand of Hitlerism. As for civil liberties, the clamor is mounting for restrictions upon speech and press. Aliens are being rounded up, registered, and finger-printed. Jehovah's Witnesses are being mobbed, beaten, and outlawed. Thus, step by step, does the Nazi horror conquer us. By our own voluntary action, under the influences of terror which have no imaginable relation to reality, do we do to ourselves what Hitler could not do to us by power of arms in a hundred years. Yet the result is the same as though he had us in his clutch. In other words, Hitler hasn't got to come over here to conquer us. We'll do the job for him!

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS IN CONSCRIPTION

The Conscription Bill now before Congress, and perhaps passed before this editorial can appear in print, is an abominable measure, going far toward taking this country into that process of militarization which has been the ruin of Europe. Think of the millions of Europeans in times gone by who have fled to this country to escape the ignominy and tyranny of conscription, and now upon these persons and their children we impose, in *peacetime*, the abominable system they left behind! It would be unbelievable, were it not for the madness of fear which has swept America not so much as a re-

action upon events in Europe as the consequence of the deliberate and well-calculated policy of President Roosevelt, for which he will in due course stand indicted before the bar of history. There are many evils in the Burke-Wadsworth Act, of which the Act itself is the most grievous. But none is more immediately important than that of the status of conscientious objectors under the law. The army, be it noted, urged upon Congress that conscientious objectors be given no recognition at all, but simply be punished for their contumely. So far have we already been removed from the old sanctities and traditions of this country! In answer to an appeal at one of the hearings on behalf of the objectors to war, one patriotic senator bellowed that "we'll build prisons enough to take care of them all." But the bill as reported provided exemption for "any person . . . who is found to be a member of any well-recognized religious sect whose creed or principles forbid its members to participate in war in any form." In challenge of this provision as inadequate and unfair, Dr. Walter Van Kirk, of the Federal Council of Churches, said:

> To exempt only such persons as are members of sects "whose creed or principles forbid its members to participate in war in any form" falls far short of meeting the requirements of the existing situation. Were this act to be adopted in its present form, a grave injustice would be done to those members of other religious bodies who are no less sincere in their opposition to war and compulsory military service.
>
> Practically all of the larger denominations of this country, by official action, have expressed concern for and their purpose to defend the rights of those of their number who have conscientious scruples against participation in war.

Here is the point—that conscientious objection to war is a matter not of membership in any religious body but of the conscience—the inward spiritual conviction—of each individual concerned! There are birthright Quakers, members of a church which has opposed war for three hundred years, who are ready to join in this war, and there are Unitarians, whose church has never taken any official stand against war, who are absolute pacifists. The government provision on this question is as bad as everything else in the proposed bill.

HYSTERIOTS

Here is a new word to describe the people in this country who have lost their heads and thus gone mad over the war. "Hysteriots"—the victims, and frequently the fomenters, of hysteria! Politicians are of course numerous in this company, beginning with the President whose address to Congress on rearmament was the most hysterical speech ever spoken by a statesman in responsible position. Having frightened the nation into conniption fits, Mr. Roosevelt has been trying ever since to calm things down, only to discover the old truth that it is easier to start a fire than to extinguish one. Intellectuals, of course, are preëminent hysteriots, as witness Walter Lippman, Dorothy Thompson, Lewis Mumford, Waldo Frank, et al. If these writers had eaten of some insane-root, as in the fairy story, they could not be more mad than they actually are at this moment. The enemy is all about us!—the "Fifth Column" may seize the country at any moment!!—Hitler will soon be across the seas and landing on our shores!!!—we must declare war *now,* sooner if possible! Wh-e-e-e-w-w-w!!!! College professors are the same hysteriots in this war that they were in the last war. What is there about academic learning that makes it so easy for a scholar to go just plumb crazy? While the great mass of college students are keeping their heads admirably, presidents and faculties, led by Conant of Harvard and Seymour of Yale, are raging like whirling dervishes. Clergymen, be it said, are with few exceptions keeping calm and cool. The churches are leading not merely the idealisms but also the sanity of the nation. It would all be so funny, this hysteria, if it were not so dangerous and tragic. You see—we have been all through this before! This is not the first time that the Germans have been Huns, that the Germans have been conquering Belgium, France, and Europe, that the "Beast of Berlin" was on his way to America, that we are in danger and must fight! It all happened in the last war—the hysteriots in Washington, in the newspapers, in the colleges, went raving crazy, and in due course we went to war, with the results that everybody knows. Are we going to do this fool thing again? Yes, if the hysteriots have their way! No, if the people keep their heads and know what is good for them, for America, and for the world!

Where Are These Fifth Columns?

E. DIXWELL CHASE*

Most dangerous of all the "columns" of which we are hearing so much may be the editorial column which is more inspired by honest zeal than by specific information. The raw material of the fifth columns which have done such traitorous work in Europe has almost never been labor leaders, progressives, or the peace movement. Instead, practically without exception, the underground organizations helping the Nazis have been compounded of labor's foes in the world of big business, reactionary politicians, or military spokesmen in or out of the armed forces. It may not be the same way in America, but the least that American commentators can do is to know what they are talking about before drawing false conclusions and foisting them upon their readers in the United States.

In a recent address before the National Conference on Constitutional Liberties, Edwin S. Smith, NLRB member, stated that "a drive to identify American labor with the 'fifth column' had been started by those persons in and out of the government who have vigorously opposed all forms of progressive legislation for the protection of labor." He added that much of the agitation

*Associated with the *Nofrontier News Service,* recently returned from an extended stay in Europe.—*Editor.*

over aliens was also "part and parcel of the attack of reactionary elements on the gains made in the last few years by labor." This indication that the war scare is being used in America by reactionaries as an instrument against labor and progressive movements is borne out by many sources, an example being a recent editorial in a small New England newspaper typical of many, entitled "The Enemy within the Gates." It shows clearly a serious lack of accurate information on the actual fifth column activities in the countries that have been attacked by Hitler.

This editorial, after recalling the effects of treachery in these countries, states that America must guard against similar dangers at home by establishing "internal security." The editorial continues:

> To achieve this aim certain principles must be kept in mind:
>
> (1) We must guard—not in a mood of hysteria, but through sound common sense—against the misguided groups and individuals in our own country who do not believe in private enterprise, and would sacrifice it for some other way of life. It is they who, by word or deed, would fill the role of "fifth columnists" in America if opportunity offered.
>
> (2) We must not let the erroneous thinking of a second group muddle our thoughts on preparedness. This group does not recognize the inseparability of our various freedoms—freedom of speech and government of representative democracy, and a business system of private enterprise—and its failure to appreciate this important truth is likely to be actually as dangerous as the attitude of the deliberate enemies of our way of life.
>
> (3) We need, at a time when industrial efficiency is so vital to national defense, to guard against attempts to cripple and hobble our manufacturing enterprises. The LaFollette bill recently introduced in Congress, a piece of legislation that would prevent manufacturers from guarding effectively against sabotage and subversive activities with America's plants, is a dangerous example of this type.

To persons familiar with the press and activities of the various political groups in Europe during the last nine months, this editorial has a familiar ring that is not comforting. Such persons recognize in it the very battle cry of those political groups which only a short time ago proved to be the real traitors—the political right and the military. The danger was by no means greatest from the local Nazi parties, but rather from business men of reactionary tendency who saw in the threat of a Nazi invasion a chance to hold down labor movements and progressive organizations.

A case in point is a large and well-known Dutch firm employing more than 20,000 men. Last fall the managers of this company called in their employes in groups of several thousand at a time and told them that in the event of a German invasion they must set up no kind of resistance whatsoever, either military or peaceful; that they should, on the contrary, coöperate with the Nazis and do everything they could to conduct themselves in such a way that the business would be left intact and relatively independent. The same firm had just received a large order from one of the British dominions for electrical equipment, with the stipulation that it be manufactured in Holland. Finding itself unable to complete the order in the required time, the firm had had the remainder of the goods made in Germany and sent to Holland, where it was stamped "Manufactured in Holland," and sent on its way.

This is but one case among many. Another was a deal put through for the Dutch Government by a Belgian business man and a German firm in Holland whereby Holland was to purchase a large order of German anti-aircraft guns. It is reminiscent of the case from the last war when the forts at Liége were constructed by Krupp engineers.

From Switzerland comes another example of the fact that the real danger of treachery in Europe has always come from the right rather than from the left. On the eighth of May in the Grand Council of Geneva, a Socialist deputy, following up an interpellation of the Government dated from 1938 regarding the suspicious activities of the German students at the University of Geneva, showed that the councilors of State, or rightist affiliation, had winked at the activities of these students even after two of them had actually been arrested and jailed for behavior deemed injurious to the safety of the country, and this upon the recommendation of the Chief of the Department of Public Education, M. Lachenal. Strangely enough, M. Lachenal also headed the National Union Party of Geneva, an extremely reactionary group of Genevese business men. Less than a year before, this group had participated in a conference at Montreux *attended by none other than the now-famous Quisling of Norway.* The corporate state was discussed as well as ways and means of suppressing Communists and Socialists. And so it was that with the examples of Norway, Holland, and Belgium fresh before their eyes, these Genevese councilors continued to allow the Nazi students to carry on their studies in "Geopolitics," which oddly enough, seemed to require the mapping and surveying of important passes and routes through the country.

A British weekly, commenting on a call for action against "the enemy in our midst" issued by certain lords and government officials, turned back to some of the statements made by these very men about Hitler not so long ago. Lord Rothermere, writing in his *Daily Mail* in May, 1938, says: "Great numbers of people in England regard Herr Hitler as an ogre, but I would like to tell them how I have found him. He exudes good fellowship. He is simple, unaffected, and obviously sincere. He is supremely intelligent . . . There is no man living whose promise given in regard to something of real moment I would sooner take. . . . Herr Hitler has a great liking for the English people. He regards the English and the Germans as being of one race." Said Lord Beaverbrook in the *Daily Express,* his own paper, in October, 1938: "We certainly credit Hitler with honesty and sincerity. We believe in his purpose stated over and over again, to seek an accommodation with us and we accept to the full the implications of the Munich document." And Churchill himself, in his book *Great Contemporaries,* found that Hitler was not such a bad fellow: "The story of his struggle cannot be read without admiration for the courage, the perseverance, and the vital force which enabled him to challenge, defy, conciliate or overcome all the authorities or resistances which barred his path." In a speech on November 11, 1938, he also stated: "I have always said that if Great Britain were defeated in a war, I hoped that we should find a Hitler to lead us back to our rightful position among the nations." We know that these men are not imbeciles. Perhaps at that time they still sincerely hoped that a satisfactory deal could be made with this man for whom they were apologists. Yet how could any man loyal to democracy and to morality overlook so cheerfully the rottenness of Hitler's methods, or even express admiration for them?

In Norway it was a small group of such men, secretly enamored of the Hitlerian method and scornful of the rights of the working man, which turned the country over to the Germans. Quisling himself, who had never amounted to much in the Norwegian political picture, had relatively little effect in bringing about the

final betrayal. Rather it was a handful of army officers who, by granting leave to thousands of men in the Oslofjord and Trondhjem garrisons on the night of the attack, demonstrated the fact that a few reactionary men strategically placed can nullify the most sincere loyalty of the working people.

And the story of the battle of Flanders and the defection at Sedan, with its ensuing dismissal of fifteen top-ranking generals in the French army, remains to be told.

In demanding that America learn the lesson of Europe before it is too late, the writer of the foregoing editorial would have done well to make sure that he had learned the lesson correctly himself; for by pointing the danger signal exactly away from the spot that proved in Europe to be the source of treachery and toward the left which has, with the exception of the Communists, shown itself to be the chief pillar of loyalty, he is dangerously misleading the well-intentioned but too often poorly informed in America.

Prelude to Tyranny

O. A. HAMMAND

Washington is in a storm. The President has asked billions for armament; Congress has proposed sweeping and unusual measures; the Supreme Court has used its power to crack down on the Witnesses of Jehovah, the Constitution has been forgotten, and the country is swept by a wave of hysteria and fear. How then does it look for democracy?

It is not necessary to guess. We can turn back to the last war. It soon became apparent that the young men of America did not want to fight on European battlefields, so a draft act was passed to force them. Back of the draft was the war machine with its propaganda propounded from platform, school, and church. Special machinery was soon set up: "The Committeee of Public Information."

It was the business of this committee to produce the proper kind of propaganda for distribution throughout the whole country. The organization consisted of a National Director, appointed by a Committee of Public Information, and a chairman for each state, appointed by the National Director. Speeches were made not only in theaters but in other places where audiences might be secured, for example, hotel dining rooms and churches. Figures published afterwards showed that the committee issued 75,099,023 pamphlets and books, promoted 755,190 speeches, and spent $6,738,-223.

Propaganda raged. It was official and unofficial. Everyone who heard a story about German spies and war atrocities was expected to repeat it and was liable to be suspected as being disloyal or perhaps a German spy if he did not do so. People were even brought before "Kangaroo Courts" for no other reason than that no one had heard them say any violent or defamatory thing about Germany or "To hell with the Kaiser." Super-patriots patrolled the streets looking for anyone who might be suspected of not actively supporting the war and on occasion, when suspects were discovered, if they were saying nothing they were sometimes goaded into talking and forced to commit themselves for their country and against the Kaiser. Motion pictures were displayed portraying German soldiers seizing women and dragging them away; and stories of cutting off the hands and feet of Belgian children were heard on every side. This was all a part of the great game of war.

The government clamped down. Freedom of speech and of the press was gone. Nobody was allowed to publish anything or say anything opposed to the war or he was liable to arrest and imprisonment or to violence by someone in the name of loyalty or patriotism. A man in my home town was assaulted by patriots because they said he was not respectful to the flag, and some members of the Salvation Army assisted in beating him up. A man standing on the street with a baby in his arms, watching a parade, was hit over the head by a deputy sheriff because he did not take off his hat quickly enough when the flag came by. Violence and lawlessness were general, and anyone who offended or was suspected of offending against the patriotic standard might be beaten up or put in jail.

Here and there a great soul went right on about his affairs and criticized the government and the war. One of the most conspicuous was Eugene V. Debs. He was sent to the Federal penitentiary in Atlanta.

Oppression was applied in every direction. "Work or fight" was a popular slogan and every young man was scrutinized carefully to determine whether he had any decent excuse for not being in the war or whether he was a slacker. Committees went out and sold liberty bonds, public schools sang patriotic songs, and churches opened their doors for dances and organized the girls into groups to go out to the army camps and dance with the soldiers. State universities were put under the rule of army officers who sent the presidents of the universities cards authorizing and permitting them to come and go and walk freely around the campus. Railroads were taken over by the government, and no one could build a house or even a barn without permission, or buy more than a limited amount of coal at a time.

A strict limitation was put on foodstuff. The price of food was high. Many salaried employes suffered severely during the war. As a general rule salaries advanced, but many white collar employees, among them Federal, state, and municipal officers, were hardly able to make both ends meet and continue a decent existence. Even the money which a householder had could not be used to advantage. He was not allowed to make his own choice and buy the kind of food which he was accustomed to have and which he and his family needed. With every allotment he must buy a certain proportion of rough food, commonly called cow food, which he did not like and did not want and could hardly eat without making himself sick.

America discovered that war was not essentially murder, nor plunder, nor licentiousness; but was essentially dishonesty and tyranny.

Shot by Both Sides

IF headlines told the honest facts
Instead of what one daily reads:
"DEMOCRACY WOUNDED BY ALLIED ACTS,"
"TRUTH, NONCOMBATANT, BLEEDS."

RALPH CHEYNEY.

Why Democracy Often Fails

VICTOR S. YARROS

The older, nineteenth-century Liberals believed and said that the remedy for the ills of liberty was more liberty, and for the shortcomings of democracy, more democracy. That was more than a cliché, or tag. The truth is that most of the so-called "weaknesses" of democracy as a system turn out on analysis to be weaknesses of human nature unaccustomed to, and untrained and undisciplined for, the proper working of democratic institutions.

Democracy is said to be inefficient. When action is imperative, the totalitarian governments seem to have certain important advantages over those executives that have to reckon with bicameral parliaments, with majorities and minorities, with party leaders and strategists. Talk, delays, obstruction, deliberate filibusters, vanity and pride of ambitious individuals in high positions hamper and cripple capable executives, and may cause defeat in war or in a domestic crisis.

In extolling Italian Fascism, Bernard Shaw more than once asked querulously, "Do we want things done?" He implied that the British system suffered from too many checks and balances, and involved dawdling and waste of time, energy, and opportunity.

What are the facts? No organization or institution can function without intelligent and reasonable rules of procedure. Such rules should provide for fair and adequate discussion, for limitation of debate in emergencies, for action on pending measures, for majority rule in all cases where the written or unwritten organic law contemplates majority action.

Where the rules of procedure permit and encourage obstruction, filibusters, wilful waste of time, there is something wrong with the leadership. The right rules are not adopted because they are not desired. Some dominant groups or interests are *opposed* to democracy. Why, then, blame democracy for the consequences?

Our own Congress is notoriously poorly organized. Committees "bury" bills referred to them for consideration. Committee chairmen are given far too much power, and they often abuse it. There is no legislative program, and no method in dealing with legislation. Hence, jams, confusion, blind voting, log-rolling, and all the evils and vices we complain of under democracy. But sincere believers in democratic processes know that these evils and vices are *not* inherent in democracy. As already said, they are attributable to a lack of willingness to apply democratic principles consistently and to abide loyally by the results of a full and honest application of those principles.

Another source of inefficiency and waste by democracies is to be found in our failure to educate our youth and our adult population for living and working under free and representative or popular institutions. Our civic and political education is—with few gratifying exceptions—dull, lifeless, formal, and superficial. It cannot and does not arouse or maintain interest in government. It does not create any desire to *fight* corruption and maladministration. It does not send forth active workers for good government. It glosses over, or ignores, the most flagrant abuses of power and office. Professors, instructors, and teachers are not encouraged to treat government realistically and dramatically. They are timid and perfunctory. Certainly the courses on government and politics *can* be made vital and absorbing.

Furthermore, our school and college curricula overlook the necessity and the possibility of courses designed to promote intellectual integrity, honesty, and fairness in political discussion. There is, alas, very little honesty in political oratory, political platforms, and political debates in legislative assemblies. As already pointed out, the outs never give credit to the ins, and the ins are slow to recognize merit and truth in the criticisms of the outs. Political campaigns are supposed to have educational value; as a matter of fact, they confuse issues, poison minds, stimulate hate and fear, and cause many self-respecting persons to shun party politics and elections. A campaign is too often a malodorous mud-bath. Rant and cant please crowds, but alienate the judicious.

Intellectual integrity cannot be taught in text-books or lectures, but it can be generated and nourished and rendered attractive by various indirect and subtle means —by example, by contrasts drawn from history, by analysis of current propaganda, and calm refutation of falsehood. Debates in classrooms can be organized and guided with tact and scientific method. Students can be shown how *not* to debate a given controversial issue, as well as how to debate it without sophistry or trickery.

Washington's Farewell Address contains many pertinent and candid observations on the ugly and seamy side of partisanship and factionalism. Washington hoped the American people might avoid partisanship in their politics. Experience has proved the impossibility of such avoidance. Parties are inevitable in a free democracy, but the party system does not preclude intellectual honesty and fairness in political discussion. Our educational system has not seriously attempted to moralize politics and to emphasize the duty and privilege of clean, sincere, honest thinking.

The revolt against democracy is, in part at least, a revolt against practices and methods that violate the spirit and essence of democracy. Why not give genuine democracy a chance? Finally, the divorce between democratic government and the spoils system, the loaves and fishes of public office, must be much more complete than it is. Men's ideas will always be largely dictated by their economic interests, but this does not mean that the fight of parties for power should also be a fight for fat jobs, contracts, pecuniary benefits. The victory of a party at the polls should involve nothing but a transfer of policy-making offices—ministries, premierships, and the like. A comprehensive merit system should cover all the positions and jobs in the fields of administration. The voters should put in the men who will give the orders and determine the policies; and, of course, these orders and policies should sincerely reflect and embody the mandate of the electorate, insofar as this is possible and feasible. But the hosts of employes who carry out orders should not be disturbed; they should enjoy permanent tenure as long as they remain efficient and faithful. In Great Britain this system is yielding good results, although it is by no means complete.

The spoils system as we know it is disgraceful and viciously undemocratic. It accounts for much of the waste and incompetence most of us profess to deplore.

In democracies public office should be a public trust, and high standards of service should be the rule, not the exception. There is nothing utopian about this goal, and it is essential to the success of democracy in government.

No, democracy has not failed. Totalitarianism is infinitely worse than democracy, but that reflection does not justify indifference to the abuses and excrescences that undermine and weaken the democratic forms of government.

War, Women, and Poets

MAY STRANATHAN

The group of women associated to study the cause and cure of war have no doubt considered the part women have played in both cause and cure—not the cure but the attempt to cure. As their part in the cause of war they must have thought with ironic bitterness how woman has been played upon rather than herself playing an active part. They must have given thought to the deep-set obsession in the minds of men, or rather in their emotions, that they must still in an age we call civilized fight to protect their homes, their wives, and their children—an obsession too often ending in the destruction of all they sought to protect. For it is no new thing, but age-old, that women and children are as surely destroyed by war as men are, the histories of starvation in besieged cities and the slaughter of innocents when such cities are taken bearing witness.

The romantic aspect of war as a gesture of chivalry, as the lady sent forth her knight to battle for her with her colors on his sleeve, has been lost entirely in the horrors of modern warfare. Yet it was but recently that an American newspaper, commenting editorially on the National Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, said: "The twinkle of an eye, the lilt of a pretty head, the toss of a curl, the curve of a lip, can send a peaceful man off to the nearest recruiting station with blood in his heart." Can such things be possible today?

No doubt the earnest women of the National Conference on the Cause and Cure of War have also considered how great a part religious differences have played in past wars, and are still playing to this day. Such wars have been waged with fury since King Arthur and the Knights of his Round Table sought to break the power of the heathen and establish the kingdom of righteousness by arms instead of by the Holy Spirit. As the breaking of the Mohammedan rule in Europe by Charlemagne inspired the first Christian epic, so the battles of King Arthur have inspired many poets since Malory, especially Tennyson. The lust for forcing our religion on others still exists, by all signs of the times.

Kipling is generally regarded as the chief exponent of imperialism and militarism among the later English singers. But to Tennyson, the writer of the most beautiful lyrics in any language, must be given the palm for extolling war. The poet himself seems to have realized its futility, for he tells how Arthur in his last battle fell into confusion,

> Since he saw not whom he fought,
> For friend and foe were shadows in the mist,

as he remembered the ancient prophecy that at last the heathen would rule the land. Well might this be a picture of the world today, a world ruled by heathens, though many are disguised as Christians, as they fight with all the weapons of modern warfare, bombing planes and submarine destroyers, poison gas and gigantic battleships, instead of by the power of the Spirit—loins girt about with truth, wearing the breastplate of righteousness, feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace, with the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, the sword of the Spirit—"the whole armor of God."

Emerson, in his *English Traits,* speaks of the lack of spiritual beauty in the English poets of his day such as he found in Chaucer and Chapman. He makes an exception of Wordsworth, saying he had no master but nature, and quoting Walter Savage Landor's statement that Wordsworth alone among the English bards wrote without the aid of war.

Though they now call it by other names, the same old reason for war is still given—to secure safety, food, and shelter for women and children. We now call it economic necessity, the demand for extension of trade, and the acquisition of lands to provide for a growing population. And still, despite the missionary work of Margaret Sanger and her co-workers in many lands, women are expected to play the role of the double-headed goat—to produce as many warriors as possible to send out to protect their homes and families by devastating the homes of other women and children as innocent and helpless as they. To such a pass has militarism brought us that in some lands women are being offered rewards for the production of more children than their neighbors.

During the last war a prince from one of the Balkan states, who had married an American girl, spoke to the women's clubs in many of our cities, telling them that "the loaf of bread is the chief cause of all wars." A little later an English woman, a social service worker, explained to the same clubs how it was absolutely necessary for Great Britain to control the seas since the homeland could not supply food for its people, but was dependent on its colonies and foreign trade. Today Japan might make the same excuse, and probably does.

It was not so many years ago that the Christian nations, now so sympathetic with China, were encroaching more and more on her territory, wringing concessions from her, and even talking seriously of the dismemberment of the country in the interest of civilization—and trade!

Let any woman who reads these lines of Tennyson:

> Thy voice is heard through rolling drums
> That beat to battle where he stands,
> Thy face across his fancy comes,
> And gives the battle to his hands.
> A moment while the trumpets blow,
> He sees his brood about thy knee,
> The next, like fire he meets the foe,
> And strikes him dead for thine and thee—

let her contrast this picture with the one given by the newspapers during the war in South Africa—the war which is said to have broken the heart of Queen Victoria. The news reports told of British soldiers pursuing and stabbing in the back the fleeing Boers who

were defending, as small nations are defending today, their homes and families. But there were diamond fields in South Africa, and the land must be made safe for trade and Christianity.

W. L. Fawcett, writing in the *Century* some years ago on "The Gateway to India," and the long rivalry between the British lion and the "bear that walks like a man" for the control of Khyber Pass over the mountains of Afghanistan, says: "Strictly speaking, both England and Russia are trespassers on the territory of the Ameer of Afghanistan, who is an independent potentate. The war between England and Russia in 1878 was brought about by the Ameer receiving an embassy from Russia and refusing to receive one from the viceroy of India. It resulted in the loss of many thousands of British soldiers and finally in placing Abdurahman on the throne with an annual subsidy from England, instead of Shere Ali without one."

Tennyson makes two of his heroes—if such they can be called—turn to war as a solace for their wounds of the heart in unfortunate love affairs. The neurotic lover of "Maud," though he asks earlier in the poem why he should weep if a Poland fall, or shriek if a Hungary fail, or even if an infant civilization be ruled with rod or knout, comforting himself that he has not made the world and He that made it will guide, concludes after his disappointment in love, that "It is better to fight for the right than to rail at the ill," and so goes to war, "embracing the purpose of God and the doom assigned."

Dear to the heart of the lover of English verse are the words of Sir Richard Lovelace on parting from his love and going to the wars:

> I could not love thee, dear, so much,
> Loved I not honor more.

But Tennyson shows us another view of "honor," when the disappointed lover in "Locksley Hall" would turn to war to forget his sorrow,

> But the jingling of the guinea helps the hurt that honor feels.
> And the nations do but grumble, snarling at each other's heels.

Agnes Preston Keith, an American girl who married an Englishman in the British Government Service, tells in her book, *Land Below the Wind,* of a hunt by the "empire builders" for a native of North Borneo suspected of the murder of a white trader. She relates that finding, by the aid of Dyak scouts, that the man with his family and many others was in a longhouse holding a celebration, the white men attacked from the rear, with the following result: "It was only twenty minutes. The guns of the expedition swept through the longhouse from both ends. Blood poured through the floor, raced down the tall stilts and oozed in the mud below. The men of the expedition fought for their lives, which they succeeded in saving, but between a hundred and thirty and a hundred and forty Muruts, including women and children, were killed. Those who ran from the house to the river were shot down and cut to pieces. With the exception of four women and three children, who crept into the jungle wounded, all who were in the house when it was surrounded, died. It was only twenty minutes. The longhouse blazed and then was embers. The Dyak policemen wiped their swords and slung the Murut heads which they had cut from the bodies, over their shoulders. Then the expedition of inquiry proceeded down the river. . ."

"The story is a terrible one," Mrs. Keith said to her husband. "Yes, it is," he answered, "but that story is one reason you and I can travel on this river without danger to our heads."

Let the women seeking the cause and cure of war think on the confusion of King Arthur when he could no longer tell friend from foe. Let them reflect on the record of "civilized" and "Christian" nations in dealing with those "of lesser breed," "half-demon and half-child." Let them remember the record of England in Ireland, India, Egypt, South Africa, and many isles of the seven seas, the forcing of the opium trade on a helpless and struggling China. Let them contemplate the deeds of France and Belgium in Africa, and it might be a fruitful study to consider some of the injustices done by our own United States in dealing with the Indians, the Mormons, the Negroes. Let us not be deceived by a people calling on the Lord for a blessing on his people, remembering that he who saveth his life shall lose it, and that the prophet declares even the solemn meeting and the calling of assemblies are iniquity unto the Lord; that he will hide his eyes from us, nor will hear our prayers, when our hands are full of blood.

Humanism and the Present Religious Horizon

A. STIERNOTTE

Part II. The Social Question and the New Supernaturalism

While the theological development of liberal religion was initiated by the impact of science on traditional forms of thought, the social development was marked by the impact of the rediscovered idealism of Jesus on a traditional acceptance of certain forms of social organization. Before the first World War this development was largely liberal in the European political sense. But with the disillusion resulting from the inability of the League of Nations to prevent major aggression coupled with the growing awareness that the present economic order did not possess the stability ascribed to it and was unable to provide an adequate standard of living for all men, a small section of religious liberals favored a socialist program of reform as a necessary steppingstone to their ideal, the Kingdom of God. This attitude was called Christian socialism though it had a large proportion of pacifism in its make-up. Some of these liberals even went further for they felt that modern society and the many-sided superstructure of its civilization were conditioned by social relationships emerging directly from the mode of production and exchange of commodities. The driving force for social change was regarded by them as originating from these social relationships, not from the impact of pure devotion to ideals on "the slow of heart to move," and if strong objection were to be taken to such reform, they were prepared

to drive out Satan with Satan! These for want of a better name might possibly be described as Christian Marxists though they are in an extremely small minority and have recently been thrown into confusion by the Nazi-Soviet rapprochement. That is to say, in spite of its varying character this trend toward social reform is the distinctive contribution of American religious thought to the practical aspects of life, just as the modernist trend culminating in humanism is its distinctive contribution to the theoretical aspects of life. Whatever may be said for the much vaunted Barthian tendency of European theology, it is far from measuring up to this American development.

The social reform tendency is becoming more and more enmeshed with the position classified by H. N. Wieman in his *American Philosophies of Religion* as neo-supernaturalism. This movement represents a malaise in present-day religious thought, for due to it the comfortable optimism of the liberal orientation is now badly shaken, and the liberal outlook is being attacked by many who were once foremost in its propagation. The extent of this type of theology, which is the very opposite of humanism, and the number of its adherents may be appreciated from the recent series of articles in the *Christian Century* on the subject "How My Mind Has Changed in This Decade." A comparison of Charles Clayton Morrison's recent articles in *Christendom* with those he wrote five years ago in the *Christian Century* is enough to make one weep!

This new supernatural outlook is quite different from the old supernaturalism—it is a much tougher nut to crack. It seems to be a reflection of the inability of social reform movements to stem the rise of totalitarian advance in the last few years. As a matter of fact, neo-supernaturalism received a tremendous impetus through the theology of Karl Barth, which significantly enough arose in the nation which fell victim to the most virulent form of Fascism. American neo-supernaturalists to be sure are not completely at one with Barth, though they cannot deny their debt to him. Paul Tillich and Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Theological Seminary, as well as Clifford L. Stanley of Cape Girardeau, Missouri, are among the ablest exponents of this new supernaturalism. In the case of Niebuhr the trend to the supernatural as portrayed in his very important works starting with *Moral Man and Immoral Society* to *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics* has reached paradoxes of irrationality not equaled by his colleagues. Other trends of thought which are allied to this movement are the prevailing fashion in some circles of returning to the Danish theologian Kierkegaard as well as the traditional note sounded in the Oxford and Edinburg conferences of 1938. These conferences were significant in that they brought to a focus the great differences in approach between the American and European delegates. They seemed to speak a different language, the American representatives being bent on introducing economic and social considerations wherever occasion offered, which were usually clamped down by European theologians who were not interested in "man's phenomenological existence" but in his eternal destiny! The conferences, though valuable in indicating the trend toward a reunion of churches, were deplorable in the sense that they tended to ignore the fact that American theology has a distinctive character of its own, which need not be unduly influenced by the return to medieval types of religious thought so prevalent in Europe today, such as Barthianism and neo-Thomism. Harold Bosley reviewing the seven conference books in *Christendom*, in the summer of 1938, gives a full report of these discussions. He seems to have found the root of the whole matter when he states: "The crucial difficulty in this attempt of non-Roman Christianity to state its case is its tacit adoption of supernaturalism." And Dr. Bosley's conclusion will be echoed by every empirical theist and every humanist:

> After twenty centuries of trying hardly successfully to make supernaturalism relevant, it does seem not inopportune to suggest that we should follow the lead of contemporary philosophy (which spent twenty centuries in the grip of a one-sided idealism) and devote at least one century to trying to discover the deeper implications of naturalism.

Such are the influences which seem to minister to the new supernaturalism. Now the strangest thing about it is the fact that it is advanced by men who have made a profound study of social affairs, men who are in fact quite familiar with the general Marxian approach to historical problems. How can one combine Marxism and supernaturalism? The explanation seems to be due to several factors—the inability of reform movements to reach their objectives, the bewilderment of liberals at the resilience of the present economic order, the internal dissensions of the Marxist parties, and perhaps more than anything else the fact that recent European political alignments have been so unexpected as to shatter for a good many years to come the hope that international affairs would be placed on a basis of coöperation rather than force. All these obstacles to the realization of social ideals helped to create that mood of defeatism in human possibilities which is one of the chief characteristics of neo-supernaturalism. In other words, when certain religious progressives became sufficiently involved in the social question they came face to face with Marxism. The picture it gave of the world was dark and cold—the clash of blind forces in marked contrast to our fond "illusions" of peace and harmony. It is at this time that the writings of Reinhold Niebuhr began to reflect his growing "enervation" at the "illusions" and "pretensions" of liberalism. One would think that the world to him, as to Matthew Arnold,

> So various, so beautiful, so new,
> Hath really neither joy, nor love, nor light,
> Nor certitude, nor peace, nor help for pain;
> And we are here as on a darkling plain,
> Swept with confused claims of struggle and flight,
> Where ignorant armies clash by night.

To be confronted with the Marxian outlook and to appreciate its contributions to the riddles of modern society was indeed a great achievement but it was very difficult to harmonize this outlook with Christian tradition, unless the values implied in that tradition were rooted out from their individualistic bearings to be attached firmly to the social goals of the middle and lower classes. The cost of this reinterpretation was too high to be paid by the neo-supernaturalists, though one might venture the opinion that the peculiar tough-mindedness of Harry F. Ward was able to accomplish it. So they made this ingenious compromise—if the world was grim and men were seemingly unable to make it better, that was plainly because man in his social as well as in his individual relations was what "classical religion" had always said he was—a miserable sinner! So it was possible for Reinhold Niebuhr to move politically to the left, and theologically to the right, for to him social calamities are the judgments of a holy God against man, not so much for man's inhumanity to man as for his

presumption in attempting to improve his life and give it meaning. This is the supreme sin, the supreme apostasy, to dare to give life a meaning derived from naturalistic philosophy when only the supernatural can give life such supreme meaning. This is the root of one of Niebuhr's most curious conceptions to the effect that the extreme-leftists in the labor movement are possessed of demoniac tendencies when they (no doubt overconfidently) claim to change the world and give life a new meaning. This is not to say that the extreme-leftists are above criticism, for they deserve much just now. It is ill-advised, however, to regard any movement as the victim of demoniac tendencies, for those who uttered that abomination "He hath a demon" have been judged at the bar of history and found wanting. History has never been so crushing as on those who have been too glib with their appellations of demons and blasphemers.

Broadly speaking this new theology implies that the natural order cannot ascend to levels which are the province of the supernatural. Hence "the impulses of nature" and "the impulses of spirit" are sharply divided, and theological *tours de force* must be invented to reconcile the two, if they can ever be reconciled! It is clear that this tragic theology is involved up to its neck in contradictions, paradoxes, and tensions of various sorts. It even appears to delight in them! It claims a distinct profundity when it can point to similar paradoxes in the world of nations and society. With the stoic contemplation of the descent of man, it consoles itself with the ascent of a holy God. If the Kingdom of God is not realized in history, it will be at the end of history, and neo-supernaturalists will probably wait that long for it. That will no doubt be "beyond tragedy"! As for man, he is a most unfortunate creature caught between the Charybdis of nature and the Scylla of spirit. He has unfathomable possibilities of evil in his make-up, yet should he strive for higher ideals the very moment he dedicates his life to them he commits the supreme sin, for his ideals are but dust and ashes to the demands of a holy God. To strive after perfection with the profound conviction that perfection is worthless before the superior demands of a supernatural order—such is the sweet moral injunction of the neo-supernaturalists! The conception they wish to impress is the thoroughly plausible one that no matter how high man's achievements there will still be far-sighted spirits who will not rest content till they have ascended higher peaks. But the theological framework into which this idea is put is so irrational as to defeat moral effort.

Incidentally, in this tacit assumption of man's apparent inability to achieve his social ideals there is a great similarity with Spenglerian defeatism. This is a field of research which deserves to be explored more fully, and then one might possibly come to the conclusion that neo-supernaturalism, in spite of its radical strictures against the liberal tradition, is far from being radical itself. In other words, neo-supernaturalism, which is so fond of speaking of judgments of history, may itself receive a judgment of history. Though some of its social criticisms are undoubtedly very penetrating and its leaders of unquestioned eminence, one might venture the opinion that it is a religion whose nerves have cracked. The naturalistic theists are aware of its dangers. For instance, this is the way in which H. N. Wieman regards it:

> When neo-supernaturalism repudiates in the field of religion every rational method for distinguishing between truth and error, between reality and illusion, between good and bad, it opens the gates to every form of bigotry, cruelty, and violence.

With that most significant judgment one may turn from the supernaturalists to the empirical theists, of which Mr. Wieman is indeed one of the best representatives. He, along with Shailer Mathews and Harold Bosley, have discarded the old idealistic philosophy and have expressed the God-idea as a process in nature. Let us examine briefly their conceptions of this process. To Mr. Wieman,

> God is not the order of matter, but he is that in the interactions of matter by virtue of which it carries the possibilities of higher value.

To Shailer Mathews,

> God is our conception, born of social experience, of the personality-evolving and personally responsive elements of our cosmic environment with which we are organically related.

And to Bosley,

> God might be defined as that aspect of progressive integration in the universe which manifests itself on the human level in the growth of values.

Now it is necessary to be clear as to what this empirical theism really means. The older theism considered God as the pure Absolute of the philosophy of idealism, the one real object in contradistinction to the world of matter, a world of mere appearance or illusion, as countless university students have been taught (and thus lost to naturalism) through Bradley's *Appearance and Reality*. Pantheism identified God with the universe and did not seek for a God beyond the world of natural processes. Now the significant thing about this new theism is that in view of its even more modest approach than pantheism, it might be described as infrapantheism (if one may coin the word) for it does not say that God is the universe, but only that certain aspects or elements in the cosmic environment are to receive the divine sceptre. Now it may be that this is the most significant theological reconstruction of the present day short of humanism, but it is a far cry from the traditional conceptions of Christianity, and it is extremely doubtful if "the new wine" of the empirical theists can be poured into "the old bottles" of historic Christianity. The neo-supernaturalists are, however, closing in upon the empirical theists who usually defend themselves by declaring that since they find God in the empirical processes of nature, their God is just as much "other" as the God of the neo-supernaturalists. If one wishes to avoid trouble with the neo-supernaturalists one has simply to say that one's conception of God is "other." That little word "other" is thus a sort of theological *laissez-passer* to green pastures of theological harmony and spiritual comfort!

Nevertheless, one must admit that there is a good deal of similarity between empirical theism, humanistic theism, and Unitarian humanism, and one would hope that these forms of natural religion would combine in a non-theological trinity to oppose a return to traditional modes of thinking. This should not prove too difficult, for there are no mediators between the empirical theists and the religious humanists, except the humanistic theists. As E. Stanton Hodgin states, in *Humanist Sermons:*

> Theism and humanism are not exclusive faiths. They overlap all the way, but there is a difference of emphasis and application that makes the religions of the pronounced theist and the pronounced humanist essentially different, even

though the one emerges from the other and is never wholly differentiated from it.

The distinction between empirical theism and humanism seems to be somewhat as follows: If one thinks of the evolutionary process of the universe in personal terms and as able to give personal response, one is a theist; if one thinks of this process as impersonal, though coming to consciousness in man, one is a humanist. But the vital relationship uniting man to the evolutionary and value-creating process from which he has come is emphasized by both empirical theists and humanists. The humanists would probably say that to give the name God to the integrating process of the universe is very confusing to the vast majority of people whose idea of God is entirely different. He would prefer to say simply "the integrating process of the universe" and let it go at that. There is thus an impasse between the empirical theists and the humanists which has not yet been brought to a definite conclusion, but there is no question as to their basis in naturalism and they thus form a bulwark against Barthianism.

[*To Be Concluded*]

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

XX

The New York Yearly Meeting of Friends has issued a statement in which it is said:

We declare that it is not the answer of democracy to a troubled world to demand conformity to established notions of geography, racial supremacy, political science or economic structures at the price of the immortal soul of man. We regard as our chief national danger the invasion of our hearts with fears that enslave and prejudices that poison life. In our communities with poise and calm we shall devote ourselves to keeping our country from such influences.

We look upon material arms and dependence upon coercive force as expressions of suspicious and evil thought, and pledge ourselves to that Power which takes away all occasions for wars and outward strivings. We encourage all under our care to be true to the promptings of conscience as a religious duty as well as a political privilege, and shall comfort and aid any who are brought into suffering on this account.

We feel that whatever usefulness our society has attained has been through obedience to the ideal of the fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man, and that only through the vigorous application of this ideal in our present situation can we hope for the preservation of constructive human society. . . . We shall devote ourselves cheerfully to our duties as citizens of our country, never permitting established customs and beliefs to weaken our steadfast conviction that real loyalty to country grows out of loyalty to the Kingdom of God.

The National Society of Friends has published a "Message to a World at War," written by Rufus M. Jones. This "Message" states:

Are we to remain passive spectators of this gigantic exaltation of force? Are we to stand watching with resignation this massed destruction of all that is most precious in the world? No, we must declare as loudly as our voice will carry and as our work of loving service can proclaim in the midst of the din, that there is another kind of power which has its ground and source in the eternal heart of God. The Christ we love and serve was the incarnation of that power in his life and in his death, and he overcame not Pilate's cross only, but the Roman empire itself. We must continue to live in the faith that in the end love like his, rooted in the life of God, will be triumphant even now in this world of explosive forces of destruction. There can be no more important mission today, when force is mechanized in its deadliest form, and each nation hopes to surpass the other with a more deadly type, than to bear witness to the invincible power of love and truth and the wisdom and patience of the kingdom of peace.

We must above everything else bear an undivided allegiance to the way of life that counts on and holds fast to the unseen and eternal forces. There must be amidst all the confusions of the hour a tried and undisturbed remnant of persons who will not become purveyors of coercion and violence, who are ready to stand alone, if it is necessary, for the way of peace and love among men, determined to weary out all the devices of force and cruelty, and to take the Kingdom by meekness and unfeigned love. And this loyal remnant must be settled in mind to demonstrate the reality of this faith, and be willing to endure any sacrifice, even the last full measure, to make this way of love work and prove its worth in a world that glorifies force. The supreme tragedy, in a world full of tragedies, would be the loss of this faith and the disappearance of a body of persons determined to give expression to it.

According to the *Christian Century,* Dr. Morris C. Robinson, of the Grace Presbyterian Churches in Minneapolis, has declared:

There is no cause for hysteria. We are reaping what we have sown. We have sinned and are now suffering the penalty for sin. . . . There is no teaching of Jesus which can be advanced in support of organized warfare.

The *Christian Century* publishes the following news item:

The Northern Minnesota Annual Conference of the Methodist Church passed the following resolution: "We must not yield to the fallacy that the United States must get into the war to establish a new peace basis. We can best serve by staying out. The mood of either victor or vanquished in war cannot aid peace. Only those who have escaped the blood lust of actual fighting can see a world situation steadily and see it whole.

At the Catholic Cathedral in Denver, according to the *Christian Century,* Hugh L. McMennamin said recently:

Like many of you I went through the World War. I went up and down this state making inflammatory war speeches urging our boys and young men to enlist in a cause which I believed would make the world a better place to live in. Will we be dragged into this war? I do not know, but this I say now—I will not be dragged into it. I recall the contempt I felt for the pacifists and the so-called slackers in the last war. But no matter what contempt is heaped upon the pacifists of today, I shall be of their number.

The *Christian Century* publishes the following:

Three religious groups [have recently] upheld the rights of conscientious objectors in resolutions. In Harrisburg, Pa., the General Synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church petitioned Congress to exempt from military training and service in time of war those members of their church who had conscientious scruples against military service. In Oklahoma City the Tenth Annual Convention of the Nazarene Church for the first time placed that denomination on record concerning its attitude toward participation in war. It claimed for conscientious objectors within its ranks the same exemption from military service that is given "recognized non-combatant religious organizations." The Central Confer-

ence of American Rabbis, meeting in Charlevoix, Mich., said that they "had not changed their attitude" in maintaining that the conscientious objector's right to refuse to bear arms "on religious or humanitarian grounds" is not inconsistent "with the highest principles of Judaism."

The *Laymen's Magazine,* a national Episcopal monthly, recently circulated a questionnaire on war and peace among 1,200 Episcopalian clergymen and 1,200 laymen. Answers were received from 543 clergymen and 279 laymen. Of these, 28 per cent of the clergy and 31 per cent of the laity thought that Britain is fighting to maintain Christian civilization, while 46 per cent of the clergy and 40 per cent of the laity thought that "though the aims of neither side [were] Christian, there is a moral balance in favor of the Allies." In addition, 7 per cent of the clergy and 11 per cent of the laity thought there was no clear choice between the belligerents since unchristian forces are dominant on both sides, and 5 per cent of the clergy and 2 per cent of the laity felt it unchristian to participate in any war.

The business of maligning pacifists is getting under full headway. Thus, the Cleveland *Plain Dealer* recently referred to pacifists as "cowards," and included them in a list of "public enemies." The Methodist ministers of Cleveland resented this slander in a resolution which said in part:

> We solemnly resent the implication that we who fight for peace are to be classed with Nazis and Communists whose doctrines we utterly repudiate;

and quoted the Atlantic City declaration of the Methodists that "the Methodist church will not officially endorse, support, or participate in war."

The *Christian Century* reports:

> Failure to renew the contract of Dr. Carl Soule, professor of New Testament since 1934 at Mount Union College, Alliance, Ohio, has brought charges from the student paper and other sources that the Methodist institution dropped the teacher because the trustees believed him too pacifistic and too radical in his social views. Dr. Soule, in commenting on his dismissal, says that "administrative officials sometimes find themselves unhappily located between trustee sentiment and their own private judgment," intimating that this is one of those cases in which trustee pressure has prevailed.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation has secured the Reverend A. J. Muste, of the Labor Temple, New York, as its new Executive Secretary. Resigning from the Temple, to accept this appointment, Mr. Muste writes:

> I believe the issue of war to be the profoundest issue before the Christian Church today, and that there is no salvation for our nation, or for civilization, save in the renunciation of war. Because I believe that the F. O. R. must in humility and earnestness help the church meet the challenge of totalitarian war and the problem of conscientious objection to war, this summons is imperative for me.

The Study Table

"Good It Is"

How Green Was My Valley. *By Richard Llewellyn. New York: The Macmillan Company.* 494 *pp.* $2.75.

"There is good it is"—to employ the quaint idiom recurring so frequently in Richard Llewellyn's novel—to read in these harrowing days so simple and so charming a story of folk-life, a story so full of quiet assurance, of wistful nostalgia, of clean thinking, of a realism that is at once truthful and restrained, and of a moral idealism that rises like an offering of incense from the altars of human tragedy and triumph. *How Green Was My Valley* is a story moving with all the quiet power and majesty of a symphonic poem. As one catches its fundamental rhythms and lyric themes of simple life among the Welsh coal miners of the Valley, it is easy to sense the book's strange affinity for such musical works as Smetana's "The Moldau" or Sibelius' "Finlandia," orchestral folk epics that sing their glowing melodies against the sturdy harmonies that symbolize the aspirations and undying faith, the tragedies and triumphs of great peoples. Llewellyn's book is such a saga, an epic of the simple mineworkers in the Valley of Wales where modernized mining threatens to blackout man's sense of dignity, to destroy his self-respect, and to ruin his ancient institutions of family life and social tradition. And like the tone-poems mentioned, this story leaves the reader disturbed with "a sense sublime of something far more deeply interfused," with a consciousness of man's sublime courage and faith in the presence of disaster and insecurity.

To use another musical allusion, there is the "Leitmotif" of the steadily encroaching grind and grime of industry's assault upon the life of the Valley, the relentless impact upon the green countryside of the slag heap, the brutal swoop upon river and mountainside of the dirt and filth of smoke and debris. "The slag heap is moving again," is the trenchant phrase that embodies this motif with a sense of necessity and grimness that recalls the famous "fate-motif" of Beethoven's immortal "Fifth" and constitutes a primary figure in the story-pattern dealing with the Morgan family and their neighbors.

Gwilym Morgan, the father, is an unforgettable type of the Welsh "proletariat" at its best; he is a lovable bundle of old-fashioned piety, sturdy honesty, and delightful "horse-sense." He is "conservative" to the point of obstinacy, but there is no question as to his integrity even when he opposes the attempts of his sons to organize a union. Beth, the mother, animates the pages as an embodiment of the "eternal feminine" in her infinite patience, her uncanny wisdom, and her unbounded capacity for love and understanding. They, together with their sons and daughters, make up as delightfully interesting a family as has ever vitalized the pages of a novel. There is Huw, the youngest son. It is he who tells the story in the first person. He had been destined for something other than a miner's life. School for him, and later a profession. But he prefers to share the hard life below with his kin, and his observations show the Welsh temperament at its best; its sense of balance and dignity, its feeling of solidarity with land and people, its quiet awareness of ultimate values, and its never-failing sense of humor. The pit leaves on Huw its grimy marks of toil and tragedy, but it cannot take from him any more than it took from his father and brothers that strength of character which misfortune may bend but never break.

And there is Ivor, the oldest son, husband of the so delicately but vitally drawn Bronwen; Ivor who con-

ducts the Valley choir and brings to his Valley such unusual honor. He is killed in a mine disaster. There is Davy, the hot-headed union leader; Owen, the inventor; and Ianto who encourages Huw in the use of his fists. Lovely Angharad moves like a vision of tender beauty through the chapters; she who loves the preacher, Mr. Gruffydd, and finally, to her great unhappiness, marries young Iestyn Evans, owner of the Three Valleys mine. And, O yes, the Reverend Mr. Gruffydd! Is there a more sympathetic (or pathetic) figure in all the book? How simply and conscientiously he serves his people, both with mighty sermons and powerful prayers in Chapel and with unstinting service in home and at work, never more so than when disaster, be it strike or death, overtakes his charges. It is Gruffydd who says this about prayer to Huw: "Prayer is only another name for good, clean, direct thinking; it is not mumbling, or shouting, or wallowing like a hog in religious sentiment." And there is a volume of wholesome practical wisdom in pages 282 to 287 where the preacher discourses to young Huw about men and women.

Among the disquietingly beautiful descriptions of the book, as lovely as anything in all literature, are those that deal with the singing of these Welsh miners. This passage is from the pages that relate how the choirs of the Valley gather of an evening on the hillsides and under the baton of Ivor rehearse for a personal appearance before the Queen:

> Stillness . . . Ivor raised his finger, and from top of the hill down to bottom men and women hummed softly to have the proper key, with sopranos going up to find the octave, and altos climbing, and tenors making silver, and contraltos and baritones resting in comfort and basso down on the octave below, and the sound they all made was a lifetime of loveliness, so solid, so warm, so deep, and yet so delicate. It will be no surprise to me if the flowers of the gardens of heaven are made from such sound. And, O, to smell a smell as good to the nose as that sound sounds to the ear.

And the Valley had never known a greater day than the return of their choir from Windsor Castle where they had sung for Queen Victoria, and the proud conductor had received from her Majesty a picture of herself and a handsome baton. It is of this memorable evening of celebration and merrymaking that Huw writes so straightforward when he reports that his father had taken a bit too much of the freely flowing beer; he says:

> If a man cannot get drunk on the night his eldest son comes back home with his hand warm from the touch of a queen, and her picture making the house into a shrine for pilgrims, well, Goodness Gracious, let us all go into the earth, and be quick about it.

I have mentioned tragedy. There is the tragedy of Marged's frustrated love for Owen, of the mine-disaster that takes Ivor's life, of the shipwreck of Angharad's life, and the final blow when father Morgan, attempting to inspect the mine pumps during a strike, is killed by a cave-in. But this people is accustomed to tragedy and acquainted with grief, and nowhere is its unbounded faith expressed with more quiet assurance than in these wistful words of Huw at the very close of the book:

> It is strange that the Mind will forget so much, and yet hold a picture of flowers that have been dead for thirty years and more. . . No bitterness is in me, to think of my time like this. Huw Morgan, I am, and happy inside myself, but sorry for what is outside, for there I have failed to leave my mark, though not alone, indeed. An age of goodness I knew, and badness too, mind, but more of good than bad, I will swear. At least we knew good food, and good work, and goodness in men and women. . . How green was my Valley, then, and the Valley of them that have gone.

How Green Was My Valley is as sweet and thrilling and exalting a book as has ever been penned by hand of man. If you have not read it, you have awaiting you a moment of intense spiritual exaltation; and if you have read it, you may let these words help you decide to add this book to that shelf of "heart literature" where rest those volumes that have proved the most reliable comrades and the unfailing friends.

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

The Question of Intolerance

THE FOLLY OF BIGOTRY. *By William F. Clarke. Chicago: The Non-Sectarian League.* $1.00.

Dean Clarke's challenging volume has come out of his own experience. If ever there was a sincere believer in liberty and brotherhood, he is William F. Clarke, Dean of the College of Law of DePaul University.

The book deals with dictators and depressions, with youth and war, and points the way to a better world. As the preface says, "This volume aims at a popular presentation of certain facts and principles touching on the question of intolerance, and which are of real moment to the American people today."

This little book is a brief for democracy. The foreword is from the writings of the great philosopher Jacques Maritain, and this sentence might serve as a text for the book: "We must rescue out of democracy the passion for justice and for the dignity of the human being, which at its best democracy has supported as no other political regime has ever done."

The chapter on America's Radio Priest is interesting and objective—perhaps too objective, a little too easy on Father Coughlin.

The chapter on "Dictators" is very good. Here is a sentence we all might paste in our hats. "The casual Jew-hater is a man who has forgotten precisely why he hates the Jew, but is constantly presenting new reasons for doing so." And this one, "There is one thing, however, that the American can do, which he *must* do —refuse to subscribe to notions which will discredit a whole people."

Dean Clarke knows what America's problems are and he dares to call them by name. He is aware that religion must play its part in solving the problems, but "the Church and the political community each has its appropriate field of action, and the invasion of one by the other has always proved injurious to both." Those who are not aware that American Catholics wholly approve of the entire separation of Church and State, may ponder that strong sentence.

The problem for all countries is how to make men, women, and children happy, prosperous, and free. "We can further this common enterprise of liberty and justice and right, and preserve democracy and freedom" says Dean Clarke, "not by invading other countries, but by establishing within our own frontiers such excellent government, such liberty of press, speech and worship, such widely distributed prosperity as will move the world by the processes of example and the natural imitation of success."

JAMES M. YARD.

Missions and the American Frontier

HOME MISSIONS ON THE AMERICAN FRONTIER. *By Colin B. Goodykoontz. Caldwell, Idaho: The Caxton Printers.* $3.50.

This valuable study was inspired by Frederick Jack-

son Turner who owes his fame to his pronouncements about the American frontier. Only in this present time is the full significance of Turner's work penetrating into the workshops of the historians of American cultural life. Professor Goodykoontz has shown in this study "the organized effort of Protestants in the older parts of the United States—and particularly those who supported the American Home Missionary Society—to carry religious and educational institutions to the inhabitants of the frontier regions." As the cultural history of the United States is gradually being pieced together, the importance of Home Missions is being seen. The mission teachers and preachers came from the East, and yet as Professor Turner has pointed out, "the East has always feared the result of an unregulated advance of the Frontier, and has tried to check and guide it." One of the many important contributions of the book is the development of this too long overlooked truth. Timothy Dwight, distinguished President of Yale in the 1820's, concerned himself with the pioneers and the frontier. "In mercy," he wrote, "to the sober, industrious, and well-disposed inhabitants, Providence has opened in the vast Western wilderness a retreat, sufficiently alluring to draw them away from the land of their nativity. We have many troubles even now; but we should have many more if this body of foresters had remained at home." These "foresters" as Dwight termed the pioneers were, however, subjects for many of his ministerial students who became missionaries. The early Mission Boards thought of the West as "foreign missions." Francis Patton of Princeton also belittled the western frontier, and when the Presbyterian Seminary was established at Omaha he fought it, holding that the older, eastern schools could better prepare men for the ministry. But in the end, the patient, underpaid, persevering teachers and preachers sent out by the different eastern societies hewed out the culture of the Middle West. The story is fascinating, and Professor Goodykoontz has told it well. Every one interested in the cultural development of America must read this book.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

Washington and Lincoln

Editor of UNITY:

Anent the question what you would have done had you been Washington or Lincoln, I beg leave to present quotations from an article by Charles F. Dole, published in 1925:

"Every one says that the War of the Revolution was a holy war, if ever there was one. But why suppose that the cause of free government in the world even then depended on the use of violence? Violence and fighting belong to the blundering absolutists and tyrants. What if our forefathers had been a little more patient, as became fairminded men, and had taken pains to persuade their own neighbors instead of hazing them, and to await the movement of public opinion in England? No bloody war need ever have stained the records of our two kindred peoples. Grant that it was natural to fight first and ask later what was right. My point simply is, that, as Franklin said, the way of war was waste and foolishness and needless for the accomplishment of our purpose.

"Was the Civil War so surely necessary as men north and south thought at the time? Of course it was a shame that both sides were led to take up arms against one another. Had we been friendly men, had we caught up the saving idea of religion, we could not have lifted up our hands to destroy one another. Surely no principle of good democracy ever required a government to compel an unwilling minority to remain as permanent subjects in a free union! The constitution laid down no direction as to what should be done in such an emergency. Why should the Kindly President have insisted on drawing blood at Fort Sumter? I believe the error was in Mr. Lincoln's legalism when the nicest humanity was called for. At any rate, on both sides, in taking the way of war, we failed to do what civilized people possessing a little of the wholesome grace of modesty and proper consideration for one another, might have done to settle the perplexing questions that stood between us, and thus to establish a more durable Union not built on men's blood.

"It has often been declared that 'there are evils worse than war.' Let us rather say that there is nothing, and can be nothing, worse than war. For the system of war rolls up into itself all the evils that men count the most diabolical. It is a horrid disease that combines every other disease with itself. Call it 'madness,' as you do call it when seen in your enemies. It is contagious madness and catches everyone who touches it. It leaves its madness behind it among the victors and vanquished alike. Do you purpose to educate your youth to take on the madness? So much more surely you labor to perpetuate it. Do you propose to safeguard your people, as the continental nations of Europe attempted, by a general process of conscription? The late war has demonstrated the madness of supposing that preparedness for war is a talisman against it.

"To stop war altogether, to begin now, and for each nation to try to be if possible in advance of the others, will be to open a new era of nobler life for all mankind."

HENRY W. PINKHAM.

Newton Centre, Mass.

A UNITY Subscriber in Sweden

Editor of UNITY:

We understand that all our relatives and friends who love us must be thinking of us now when all Scandinavia is holding its breath and wondering what is coming next. It is inconceivable that such conditions can exist in peaceful happy Scandinavia. Not one thing has any of the Northern countries done, to deserve such atrocious treatment. Poor Finland, poor Norway, and Denmark now. Is it our turn next? It is beastly —that highly cultured, noble-minded, peaceful countries can't be left alone! How is it all to end, everyone wonders.

All nations seem helpless to find a way to do, as every intelligent man realizes the nations ought to do: "Live peaceably with their fellowmen and help the race advance." Browning said:

Why stay we on the Earth
Unless to grow?

If we keep up this slaughter in Europe, I think humanity has ceased to deserve the right to live! Surely it would have been better had the Creator ceased his work with flowers and beasts and never let "Man, the Beast" come into existence—God's crowning "Masterpiece!" Man should advance and climb higher and higher until the "Perfect Being" glorified God!

Is there no man or woman, not even among the highly ethical religious beings, who can help find the way to turn the tide and set mankind off in the right direction?

Man could, if he would, advance continually and much higher than he has. If all mankind bent all its power to elevate the race,—all governments, churches, schools, parents doing their utter best, we all know the advance could be sure, although slow at first.

A superior human being must and will come in time! A race of "Superior human beings," must one day people the earth. Otherwise there can be no evolution. To me that is unthinkable. Mankind must get busy with ethical problems whose solution will change our world and make "heaven on earth."

Stockholm, Sweden. RUTH RANDALL EDSTRÖM.*

*A subscriber to UNITY since its first issue.—*Editor.*